DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 371 784 JC 940 372

AUTHOR	Krech, Alan S.
TITLE	Accountability and the Movement to Performance Indicators: The South Carolina Experience [and] Guidelines for Institutional Effectiveness.
INSTITUTION	South Carolina Commission on Higher Education, Columbia.
PUB DATE	19 Jul 94
NOTE	43p.; Materials from a presentation at the Summer Data Conference of the National Center for Education Statistics (Arlington, VA, July 17-20, 1994).
PUB TYPE	Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; *Accountability; Community Colleges; Educational Assessment; Evaluation Research; Evaluation Utilization; *Institutional Evaluation; Outcomes of Education; *Performance Factors; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*South Carolina

ABSTRACT

Providing information on assessment and institutional effectiveness programs in South Carolina, this two-part document describes the use of performance indicators (PI's) and presents state guidelines for institutional effectiveness. The first part discusses assessment in South Carolina, indicating that institutions are required to develop measure to assess their effectiveness and prepare annual reports on specific PI's. This part also presents the following principles for using PI's: (1) the factor addressed and its relation to an appropriate goal must be clear; (2) a context should be provided for the PI; (3) diagnostic information should accompany the PI; (4) PI's are most useful when considered in groups; (5) while indicators are increasingly being used to determine institutional funding, the processes may not be sufficiently sophisticated or depoliticized to work; and (6) PI's will not lead to improvements if they are simply used for institutional ranking. The second part provides guidelines for institutional effectiveness assessments developed by the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education, indicating that assessment is required with respect to general education; student knowledge of their disciplines or majors; performance of graduates on licensing and certification exams; program changes due to external program evaluations; alumni follow-up studies; remedial programs; achievement of transfer students; undergraduate retention and attrition; minority student and faculty access and equity; academic performance of student athletes; library usage; administrative and financial performance; facilities usage; public service; and research. Appendixes to this section include an assessment schedule from 1988-1992, goals for quality assessment, and the state legislation authorizing the assessment programs. (KP)

ED 371 784

Accountability and the Movement to Performance Indicators: The South Carolina Experience [and] Guidelines for Institutional Effectiveness

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
A. Krech

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Alan S. Krech

Materials from a Presentation at the Summer Data Conference of the National Center for Education Statistics (Arlington, VA July 17-20, 1994)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

JC 940 372

ACCOUNTABILITY AND THE MOVEMENT

TO PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

. . . . . .

THE SOUTH CAROLINA EXPERIENCE

A PRESENTATION FOR PANEL #37
"ACCOUNTABILILTY MATTERS"

SHEEO/NCES COMMUNICATION NETWORK
AND IPEDS WORKSHOP

ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA

JULY 19, 1994

BY

ALAN S. KRECH
ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER
S. C. COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION
1333 MAIN STREET, SUITE 200
COLUMBIA, S. C. 29201

ACCOUNTABILITY AND THE MOVEMENT TO
PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

.....

THE SOUTH CAROLINA APPROACH

A. Background

South Carolina has merged two assessment/institutional effectiveness programs. The first, which was formally implemented in February of 1989, was developed in response to 1988 legislation (see Appendix III, pp. 10-11, Guidelines for Institutional Effectiveness) which required the institutions to develop measures to assess their effectiveness in accordance with Commission guidelines. The Commission was to prepare an annual report on the institutions' progress.

Guidelines were developed which phased in reporting over a four year period on 18 institutional areas (general education, majors, success of transfer students, retention and attrition, academic performance of student athletes, student development, facilities, research, etc. pp. 2-7, Guidelines). While the Commission determined the areas in which the institutions would report, the institutions were generally responsible for determining the specifics of how they would measure their effectiveness in those areas. With Commission and FIPSE (Fund for Improvement of Post-Secondary Education) support, a South Carolina Higher Education Assessment Network (which has now expanded to 48 institutions and two agencies) was formed with offices at Winthrop University to provide support and assistance with the institutions' efforts.

The emphasis of the institutional effectiveness program has clearly been on the use of assessment data for institutional improvement. The program has been well received and, with a few exceptions, well implemented by the State's public institutions. The following quote from the introduction to all five of our annual Summary Reports on Institutional Effectiveness captures the spirit of the program:

> Meaningful institutional assessment is dependent on having each college or university examine its findings against its own goals and should generally attempt to examine trends over an appropriate time period. Most important, it should interpret data, using the results of assessment to improve when weaknesses are discovered. This report makes no attempt to gloss over problems that become apparent as a result of the assessment process; it should be obvious that any institution will discover some areas that can benefit from improvement if it thoroughly assesses its activities. However, such areas should be addressed. Thus, the Commission's report places a strong emphasis on how the colleges and universities are using assessment information when problems are discovered. We believe that institutions that admit and address problems are being accountable and should be commended for their actions rather than condemned for their candor. Only if improvement fails to take place in a timely manner is it appropriate to require further remedial measures.

Please note that when the term accountability is finally introduced, it is defined in terms of institutional use rather than simply revelation of assessment information.

.....

The second part of our institutional effectiveness program was implemented following the 1992 legislative session, when South Carolina joined the wave of states that passed laws requiring annual reports on specific performance indicators, published in tables that allowed comparison between "peer" institutions. A copy of that law labeled (R262, S313) is found in your packets. There were a number of reasons for passage of this additional accountability requirement -- including 1) our failure to catch the legislature's attention with what was already in place, 2) a regional and national movement to emphasize "comparison" of institutions, 3) a regional and national movement to want "simple" statistical answers rather than narrative explanations, and 4) a specific reaction in South Carolina to such incidents of "lack of accountability" as large payouts on the contracts of terminated coaches and the indictment and conviction of James Holderman, the President of the University of South Carolina for misuse of funds.

Some of the performance indicators required by this 1992 law, such as student pass rates on professional examinations and the change in numbers and percentages of minority students over five years had already been reported and published in the 1990 and 1991 annual Summary Reports on Institutional Effectiveness, but not in a the format that allowed for easy comparison. However, the majority of the required data were new and were more specific than the information required under the 1989 program, leaving no opportunity for institutional interpretation, since all the information was in tabular and numerical form.

The colleges and universities were rather unhappy with these additional numerical reporting requirements, some of which seemed to have little or no relation to quality, and all of which were to be published in tables without the narrative context that the institutions felt was so important. In addition, the new requirements were mandated just as the original requirements were in the final phase-in year, and just as that 1989 program was beginning to mature. The Commission responded by publishing both required reports in the same volume, now nearly 300 pages long, so that the institutions can respond to the data in the tables under the appropriate topic or area in their narrative summaries. I will illustrate how this works when I discuss one of the indicators, graduation rates, in a few minutes. What is important, however, is that our decision to combine the two assessment reports allows us to provide context for the numerical data and to show how they are being used for improvement. That kind of accountability certainly matters.

B. Performance Indicators - The Growing Trend

Whether we like it or not, there is a clear demand for more use of performance indicators. We are increasingly asked to produce performance data for the Student Right to Know Act, the State Postsecondary Review

Program, the National Goals Panel and our own state legislatures. Given that reality, we need to keep certain priniciples in mind:

1. Performance indicators may provide information relating to quality, efficiency, productivity, a combination of the above, or none of the above. It is important to know exactly what factor is being addressed amd how the indicator will be related to an appropriate goal.

Although many of the South Carolina indicators are related to both quality and efficiency/productivity, it is clear that the percentage of accreditable programs that are accredited and student pass rates on licensing and certification examinations attempt to focus on the goal of quality, while graduate placement and the increase in the percentage of minority students may be related more directly to efficiency or productivity goals. On the other hand, while such information may be interesting, I am not convinced that "the percent of graduate and upper division undergraduate students participating in sponsored research programs" or the "percent of graduate students who received undergraduate degrees at the institution, within the State, within the United States, and from other nations" relate to any meaningful goals. (The first might relate to quality if you removed the words "sponsored" and "programs.)

2. Performance indicators generally require some context to be meaningful.

Probably the most controversial performance indicator in South Carolina and the nation is the institutional graduation rate. Educators correctly point out that selective universities are bound to have higher graduation rates than open-door community colleges, and military colleges are bound to have higher graduation rates than institutions with many "non-traditional" students. True as these generalizations may be, they are often falling on laymens' deaf ears, especially when the actual rates are printed in newspapers and highly respected magazines. We must all work harder to do sufficient research to be able to document why students fail to graduate and why students take longer than "four years" to graduate -- and then we must address those causes where improvement is necessary. The general public now firmly believes that it is not getting a sufficient return on its investment. To change that perception, we must change the information flow as well as address the problem.

As I mentioned earlier, in South Carolina we are asking the colleges and universities to provide specific information about their students who fail to graduate. For example, in the narrative summary on "Retention and Attrition," Clemson provides the following information which clearly impacts on their graduation rate:

> A telephone survey was conducted during the Spring Semester of 1993. The students contacted were those students who were enrolled in the Fall Semester of 1992 but did not return for the Spring Semester of 1993 although they were eligible to return. It was found that most of those students (86%) had transferred to another school. A majority (56%) left Clemson because of a desire to be nearer home. Another 22% did not return due to a change in family status. A total of only 15 of the former students indicated that Clemson could have

done something to keep them here. Six of those who thought Clemson could have helped referred to financial aid problems, two requested better advising, two asked for improvements in housing, and five wanted majors not offered by Clemson.

The narrative goes on to tell what Clemson is doing to try to improve retention, despite the fact that their graduation rate is the best in the State. They are currently looking at student loads, course availability, and program credit hour requirements to determine what changes might appropriately be made to diminish the average time to graduation. It may be fine to lay out program graduation requirements totaling 143 credit hours over eight semesters in the catalog, but if the load is too heavy or the courses are not available when needed, parents and taxpayers may have a legitimate reason to complain.

3. Performance indicators are most effective when they provide or are accompanied by diagnostic information.

Among the 1992 South Carolina performance indicators is "the number of full-time students who have transferred from a two-year, post-secondary institution and the number of full-time students who have transferred to two-year post-secondary institutions." While the matrix we publish provides some data on productivity (although the number of two-year students enrolled in or graduated from two-year transfer programs is not stated), the 1989 institutional effectiveness component seems to focus on a more important quality question, the "achievement of students transferring from two to four-year institutions." Under that original program, the senior institutions are required to provide more than numbers, and the two-year institutions are required to analyze student records to determine patterns of strengths and weakness.

4. Performance indicators are most useful when considered in groups. Any single indicator which carries too much weight may be misleading.

Those of us who have spent any significant time in assessment know that multiple measures of quality or efficiency/productivity produce much more useful data than a single measure. When we look at our success at meeting goals for minority participation in our South Carolina institutions, we examine undergraduate enrollment, graduate enrollment, undergraduate degrees, and full-time faculty. Generally, the trends are parallel, but if the percentage of minority enrollment goes up and the percentage of minority graduates goes down, the need for analysis and action is indicated.

5. Performance indicators are increasingly being used to determine some percentage of institutional funding. In theory, this is an outstanding idea; in practice, I am not convinced that the processes that I have seen are sufficiently sophisticated and/or depoliticized to succeed as intended.

Tennessee set the pace for performance funding based on indicators and Arkansas, Colorado, Kentucky, Missouri, and Texas (and there may be more) seem to be joining in. I have served on three committees in South Carolina that have examined "quality funding" or "performance funding" and am currently staffing a "Blue Ribbon Committee" on this subject made up of college presidents, legislators, and representatives of business and

industry. As the primary staff member for this committee, I have authored a proposal for Funding of Quality Initiatives in South Carolina. While that proposal focuses on two programs (1) awards for programs of outstanding quality, and (2) funding of proposals to improve quality (both to be selected by juries consisting of individuals from out-of-State from proposals submitted by the institutions), the Committee still may turn to funding more directly from performance indicators.

6. Performance Indicators will not lead to improvement in American Higher Education if they are simply used to tell legislators and the general public where each system, college, or university stands.

Summing up all that has been said previously in this presentation, data must be analyzed in context and used by those of us within the system and its institutions as a basis for action to improve. The slower we are at going about this business, the more likely it is that those outside the educational establishment will continue to dictate what performance indicators we will use, tell us what they mean, and use them for their own purposes.

GUIDELINES FOR INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

South Carolina Commission on Higher Education

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

GUIDELINES FOR INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

Date Approved: February 2, 1989

South Carolina Commission on Higher Education
1333 Main Street, Suite 300
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

GUIDELINES FOR INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

Section 59-104-650 (B)(1) of Act 629,* signed into law in June 1988, states that "each institution of higher learning is responsible for maintaining a system to measure institutional effectiveness in accord with provisions, procedures, and requirements developed by the Commission on Higher Education." The following guidelines for institutional effectiveness describe those provisions, procedures, and requirements and include a schedule** indicating the latest period during which specific assessment areas are to be implemented.

The assessment of institutional effectiveness in South Carolina is intended to strengthen the quality of higher education and to produce a continuous cycle of improvement in public colleges and universities. While assessment of student achievement is a critical measure of institutional effectiveness, there are other important factors and indicators of quality in higher education. For example, institutional effectiveness should be assessed also through an examination of physical plant utilization, academic support programs, student services, administrative services, and other components that contribute to and influence the educational process. This form of effectiveness assessment is intended to be consistent with the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Criteria for Accreditation (5th edition, 1988), and is in place already in many South Carolina institutions. Wherever possible, State colleges and universities are encouraged to use existing institutional information to prevent duplication of effort in generating assessment data. The Commission on Higher Education will remain sensitive to established institutional reporting schedules so that the state-wide effectiveness program is complementary to local planning and review processes.

The Commission appreciates the unique histories and goals of individual institutions and recognizes that such diversity will be

---

* The full text of Act 629 is found in Appendix III

** Appendix I.

reflected in a broad assortment of assessment methodologies. The Commission neither dictates nor endorses any particular methodological strategy; however, the Commission does require that the following institutional effectiveness components appear in the assessment plans and processes of public institutions (parallel references within the SACS Criteria, The Cutting Edge*, and Act 629 are noted with specific citations found at the end of the Guidelines):

1. General Education[1] --General Education provides students with skills as well as a breadth of understanding of the humanities, sciences, and social sciences -- the underpinning and context for specialized knowledge. Each institution will assess core requirements or distribution requirements that must be completed satisfactorily by undergraduate students prior to graduation. This assessment may include -- but is not limited to -- student command of that body of knowledge defined as general education by the institution.
2. Majors or Concentrations[2] --Majors provide students with specialized knowledge and skills. Each institution will assess specific discipline-based programs leading to undergraduate degree majors or concentrations. This may include -- but is not limited to -- student command of the basic knowledge of the discipline.
3. Performance of Professional Program Graduates on Licensing and Certification Exams[3] -- Student achievement in professional programs may be assessed in part through an examination of performance on licensure and certification exams in areas such as teaching, nursing and accounting. Licensure and certification exams match collegiate achievement with professional standards and norms. Each institution will provide aggregate scores from professional examinations and an interpretation of these data as they affect the curriculum.

* Throughout this document, The Cutting Edge refers to the Commission on Higher Education policy report of the same title as revised and approved in October 1987.

4. *Reports of Program Changes that have occurred as a Result of External Program Evaluations [4] -- The Commission has an ongoing external program evaluation process that is expected to produce change that enhances student achievement. Change that takes place as a result of external program evaluations should be reported to the Commission.

5. Alumni Follow-Up Studies[5] -- Graduates provide a useful source of information on an institution's programs and activities. Each institution will conduct studies of institutional and program graduates providing information germane to effectiveness assessment.

6. Entry-Level Skills Necessary for College Work[6] -- Entering undergraduate students must possess certain knowledge and skills to perform satisfactorily in the college or university. Each institution will define and assess the skills appropriate for its students at the time they enter the institution.

7. *Success of Entering Students in Meeting College or University Admissions Prerequisites[7] -- The academic preparation of high school graduates entering college affects directly the scope of remediation programs. There is a need for continuous review and strengthening of admissions criteria to enhance the quality of entering students. The assessment of student success in meeting admissions prerequisites also is a valuable information source to public and private secondary schools whose students are interested in attending South Carolina's colleges and universities. Each institution will determine the success of its entering students in meeting the college or university admissions prerequisites.

8. *Remedial and Developmental Programs[8] -- Remedial and developmental programs assist underprepared students in achieving the knowledge and skills necessary for satisfactory performance. Each institution will describe and assess its program designed to accomplish this end.

* Program currently being developed or administered by the Commission.

9. *Achievement of Students Transferring from Two to Four Year Institutions[9] -- Assessment information can strengthen the quality of college transfer courses and better prepare students for the demands of upper division undergraduate studies. Two-year (sending) institutions will be responsible for assessing the achievement of their students who transfer to four-year colleges and universities and reporting the assessment information to the Commission. Senior colleges and universities will collect information concerning students who transfer to their institutions from two-year state supported colleges and will share that information with the sending institutions. Students moving from one campus to another within the University of South Carolina System are not considered to be transfer students. However, the University of South Carolina System will collect and report the same information for students who move from university campuses at Allendale, Beaufort, Lancaster, Sumter, and Union to senior campuses of the university, and will assess the achievement of those students. The Commission on Higher Education will assist the two and four-year colleges and universities in developing a consistent format for collecting and reporting information.

10. Analysis of Undergraduate Retention and Attrition --- Success in retaining undergraduate students admitted to public colleges and universities is one way of evaluating an institution's admissions criteria, academic programs, and student services. Conversely, analysis of why students leave may provide useful information concerning any or all of these areas. Each institution will analyze and report on its undergraduate retention and attrition.

* Program currently being developed or administered by the Commission.

11. ** Minority Student and Faculty Access and Equity -- Ensuring that minority students and faculty have equal access to South Carolina's higher education institutions and their respective programs will remain a high state-wide priority. Institutions must comply with the requirements of the State program for Access and Equity to be certain that minority members are allowed equal access to and equity in the academic community.

12. Academic Performance of Student Athletes[10] -- The maintenance of admission standards, satisfactory academic performance, and appropriate program completion rates among those participating in inter-collegiate athletic programs while receiving athletic grants-in-aid is essential for the integrity of South Carolina's public institutions. Each public institution in South Carolina with inter-collegiate athletic programs will submit its NCAA Academic-Reporting Form or an equivalent document for all inter-collegiate sports in which grants-in-aid are awarded. The NCAA Academic Reporting Form or equivalent report will be augmented by or made to include the following information: the number of all athletes with grants-in-aid who do not meet published institutional admissions criteria categorized by sport and gender; the graduation rate for athletes with grants-in-aid categorized by specific degree earned; and the average number of years needed for recruited student athletes and athletes with grants-in-aid (when different from recruited athletes) to earn a degree organized by sport and gender and with parallel data on all students. Institutions will provide some analysis of how these data are being used.

** Program currently being developed or administered by the Commission. See South Carolina Higher Education Program for Access and Equity, FY 1989-90.

13. Assessment Procedures for Student Development[11] Determining student growth and development throughout the college or university experience requires the application of multiple assessment procedures. Each public institution must have a plan to assess student development in a manner that is meaningful and applicable to the services and curriculum of the institution. All institutions will evaluate student services and should consider conducting pilot studies of the effect of non-academic experience on student academic and career success.

14. Assessment of Library Usage and Collection Development Procedures[12] -- Access to and usage of library materials is a critical part of the learning process. Student inquiry fosters intellectual growth and the excitement of discovery. Each institution will ensure that students have access to necessary library materials through the regular assessment of library collections and usage.

15. Assessment of Administrative and Financial Processes and Performance[13] -- Interest in student achievement must not eclipse the need to assess administrative and financial processes and performance. For example, budget strategies and techniques should be examined regularly in light of changing departmental, school and institutional goals and objectives. Similarly, administrative processes (reporting, coordination, data management/computing, etc.), must be reviewed carefully to ascertain whether they support the college or university's mission and current needs. Each institution will report on its assessment of these areas.

16. Assessment of Facilities[14] -- Physical resources affect instruction, student services, campus-based activities, and the general fulfillment of the institutional mission. Each institution will examine its facilities, with an emphasis

upon strengthening space utilization, assessing maintenance priorities and practices, and evaluating critically whether physical resources support instructional requirements (classroom, libraries, laboratories, etc.), administrative needs (office and computing space), student services, and recreational activities.

17. Assessment of Public Service[15] -- Institutions that have public service as part of their mission will have an assessment process to evaluate the effectiveness of such service.

18. Assessment of Research[16] -- Institutions that have research as part of their mission will have an assessment process to evaluate the effectiveness of such research.

Implementation of the assessment components enumerated above will vary depending on the character and emphases of each State institution. It is unlikely that any of the colleges and universities will approach the analysis of institutional effectiveness the same way. However, each institution is required to submit, by January 1990, a "Plan for Assessing Institutional Effectiveness."* This plan must list each of the effectiveness components, indicate what method(s) is (are) being or will be used to assess the component, with what frequency, and the date of initial reporting (which must be no later than the year shown on the attached "Assessment Schedule", Appendix I). The plan should be accompanied by a report of findings for those assessment efforts that have already been implemented and evaluated.

---

* Attached as Appendix II is an excerpt from The Cutting Edge describing the goals for quality assessment, the process for attaining those goals, and the components that should be present in the procedures and programs used in measuring student achievement.

To be meaningful, the assessment of institutional effectiveness is to be ongoing and is a shared responsibility between administrators and faculty. The college or university community must take ownership in the process and be committed to learning and improving collectively through the careful analysis of assessment data. Information generated by assessment should become an integral part of the institution's planning process. Effectiveness information also will benefit the Commission as it develops an ongoing state-wide planning document to meet higher education challenges and opportunities in South Carolina.

Reporting

All institutions will submit an annual report on the assessment of institutional effectiveness prior to July 1 of each year, beginning in 1990. The technical colleges will submit their reports to the State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education, which will forward their reports along with a system evaluation to the Commission by October 1 of each year. Each institution's report should be a single document listing each institutional effectiveness component assessed and incorporating all findings from the previous year. Reporting on all or portions of some effectiveness components may appropriately occur biennially or over longer periods (e.g., results of longitudinal studies).

The Commission on Higher Education views each assessment of institutional effectiveness as a positive learning experience aimed primarily at improvement, with accountability as a secondary benefit. Thus, as institutions report their findings to the Commission and as the Commission makes those findings available to interested constituencies, the forms such reports take become increasingly important. Institutions are urged to develop reporting formats that compare their own data over time and that include narrative explanations of how findings are being fed back into the planning process to bring about positive change or continued achievement. Effectiveness reports may reference other existing studies or analyses if they are directly applicable to a specific assessment area. The Commission does not plan to use assessment data to compare South Carolina institutions, and discourages the institutions from doing

so. If comparisons are made, they should be made with state, regional, or national norms.

After an institutional effectiveness report is received, the Commission staff will review it to see whether each institutional effectiveness component is being assessed adequately on an appropriate schedule. If an institution demonstrates that the method(s) by which it assesses each institutional effectiveness component provide(s) information which is appropriately being used to verify or improve quality in the relevant aspect of the institution's programs or activities, the method(s) shall be deemed adequate. If an institution does not demonstrate that its method(s) of assessment provide(s) such information, the Commission staff will meet with institutional representatives to discuss alternate assessment methodologies.

The Commission staff will provide an annual report to the Commission's Standing Committee on Planning and Assessment describing how well each institution is evaluating each institutional effectiveness component, whether that evaluation is on schedule, and whether the institution is using the findings of the evaluation appropriately. Institutions will be provided an opportunity to respond to the report both verbally and in writing. The Committee will forward the report along with a summary of institutional responses and its recommendations to the Commission.

NOTES

[1] Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Criteria for Accreditation, 5th ed., 1988, sec. I. 1.3.9, p. 11; sec. IV, 4.1.3, p. 18.

[2] Criteria, sec. III, 3.1, p. 14; sec. IV, 4.1, pp. 18-19.

[3] Criteria, sec. III, 3.1, p. 14; sec. IV, 4.1.4, p. 19; The Cutting Edge IV. C. i.d., p. 32.

[4] Criteria, sec. IV, 4 .& 4.2, pp. 18-22; The Cutting Edge IV.C. 1.d. p. 32.

[5] Criteria, sec. III, 3.1, p. 14; sec. IV, 4.1, p. 19, sec. VI, 6.2.1, p. 38; Act 629, Section 59-104-660 (A)(5).

[6] Criteria, sec. IV, 4.1.1, pp. 15, 16.

[7] Ibid.; The Cutting Edge, I.A. p. 3; Act 629, Section 59-104-10 (A).

[8] Criteria, sec. IV, 4.1 p. 15, p. 33; The Cutting Edge, I.C, pp. 7, 8; Act 629, Section 59-104-30.

[9] Criteria, sec. IV, 4.1.1, p. 16; 4.1.3, p. 18; The Cutting Edge, I.D., pp. 9-11, IV.D. p. 34.

[10] Criteria, sec. V, 5.6., p. 35.

[11] Criteria, sec. III, 3.1., pp. 13, 14. The Cutting Edge, IV.D. pp. 33, 34.

[12] Criteria, sec. V, 5.2, pp. 30-32.

[13] Criteria, sec. VI, 6.1, p. 36; 6.3, pp. 38-41.

[14] Criteria, sec. VI, 6.4, pp. 41, 42.

[15] Criteria, sec. III, 3.1, p. 14.

[16] Criteria, sec. III, 3.1, p. 14; The Cutting Edge, III, pp. 20-22.

Appendix I

ASSESSMENT SCHEDULE*

Assessment Area Implemented	Not Later Than:**
Performance of Professional Program Graduates on Licensing and Certification Exams	1988-89
Student Athletes	1989-90
Alumni Follow-Up Studies	1990-91
Undergraduate Retention	1990-91
Public Service and Research (where part of the institutional mission)	1990-91
General Education	1991-92
Majors	1991-92
Definition of Entry Level Skills Necessary for College Work	1991-92
Library Usage and Collection Development Procedures	1991-92
Student Development	1991-92
Administrative and Financial Processes and Performance	1991-92
Facilities	1991-92

* Does not include effectiveness components that are being developed or administered by the Commission.

** It is strongly urged that institutions begin preparing early to implement assessment areas that are listed in the second and third year. For example, experience would indicate that colleges and universities cannot plan for and assess all academic majors effectively in one year.

APPENDIX II

C. System for Measuring Institutional Effectiveness

To promote high standards of accountability, the Commission on Higher Education will require that a system for measuring institutional effectiveness is in place at every public college and university; it will collect and disseminate data resulting from the measures of institutional effectiveness and it will use these data in planning.

The Commission recognizes the importance of maintaining quality academic programs, services, and facilities within all institutions of higher education in South Carolina. It believes that existing methods of State-wide quality assessment, such as its evaluations of programs and studies of the condition of facilities, serve a useful purpose and plans to continue them. In addition, the Commission realizes that every college and university is accountable to its constituents and should

report to its constituents concerning the effectiveness of its programs and services. This responsibility is clearly recognized by the colleges and universities in South Carolina, and each of these institutions has or is developing a quality assurance program.

Higher education in South Carolina has been structured in a manner that assures access by all qualified citizens and provides a variety of educational opportunities to those who wish to take advantage of them. The diversity within higher education in South Carolina is recognized by the Commission and individual governing boards. The diverse structure of higher education in South Carolina magnifies the responsibility that each institution has for maintaining an effective system of quality assessment. Because of the structure of higher education in South Carolina and the focus that has been placed upon the development of institutions with unique characteristics and diversified programs, the Commission believes that the goals for quality assessment in South Carolina should be:

1. To assure that a system for measuring institutional effectiveness is in effect on every public college and university campus in the State of South Carolina;
2. To provide a vehicle for disseminating the results of outcome measurements to the constituents within the State; and
3. To provide data relative to the effectiveness of each institution that can be used to initiate curriculum, programmatic, or policy changes within the institution.

The process by which these goals will be attained is as follows:

1. Each institution of higher education will be responsible for maintaining a system to measure institutional effectiveness and will provide the Commission on Higher Education with an outline

of the system that is implemented for review and approval. The system for measuring institutional effectiveness must include:

a. A statement of criteria by which the institution and/or programs are being assessed;

b. A means of providing quantitative results of the institutional or programmatic assessment activities;

c. A means of determining student achievement (see D, p. 33);

d. A report on changes made in programs as a result of evaluations done by the Commission.

2. As a part of South Carolina's State-wide planning process, each institution will provide the Commission on Higher Education with an annual report on the results of its institutional effectiveness program.

3. The Commission will prepare a report that will include results of institutional effectiveness, including student assessment programs. The report will also include other actions that the institutions have taken to strengthen educational quality and will contain data from previous years on the basis of which each institution can measure its progress. Information from private colleges and universities will be included for those institutions that voluntarily provide the information to the Commission.

4. The Commission on Higher Education will provide technical assistance in the development of a system for measuring institutional effectiveness for any institution requesting such assistance.

D. Procedures to Measure Student Achievement

Because student achievement is the most vital aspect of any institution's effectiveness, the Commission emphasizes that all State-supported institutions will establish their own procedures and programs to measure such achievement. The procedures and programs will be submitted to the Commission as part of the plan for measuring institutional effectiveness. They should:

1. Derive from institutional initiatives, recognizing the diversity of South Carolina public colleges and universities, the tradition of institutional autonomy, and the capacity of faculty and administrators to identify their own problems and solve them creatively;
2. Be consistent with each institution's mission and educational objectives;
3. Bear a direct relationship to teaching and learning in the classroom, enabling faculty to use the results to address student deficiencies, evaluate and improve the curriculum, and develop better teaching techniques;
4. Involve faculty in setting the standards of achievement, selecting the measurement instruments, and analyzing the results;
5. Consider the relative importance of assessment to determine student attainment as measured by an absolute standard as well as assessment of student growth in learning attributable to the influence of the institution;
6. Follow student progress through the curriculum, as appropriate, with consideration of achievement measures (a) at transition points to ensure student readiness to proceed, (b) upon completion of the major, and (c) at graduation or on leaving the institution; and

7. Include follow-up of graduates through employer studies of participation rates in further education and alumni reports of career progress.

As part of their report on institutional effectiveness, all State-supported colleges and universities will be expected to describe progress in developing their assessment programs and to submit concrete, non-anecdotal, and quantifiable information on student achievement to the Commission on Higher Education. The report should include information about the achievement of transfer students from the two-year colleges enrolled in four-year colleges and universities and about the performance of professional program graduates on licensing and certification examinations.

(R736, H3983) Act 629 (1988)

AN ACT TO AMEND THE CODE OF LAWS OF SOUTH CAROLINA, 1976, BY ADDING CHAPTER 104 TO TITLE 59 SO AS TO PROVIDE INITIATIVES FOR RESEARCH AND ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE BY DETAILING THE GOALS OF THE COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION RELATING TO EXCELLENCE FOR STUDENTS, INSTRUCTION AND EDUCATIONAL SERVICES, RESEARCH FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, AND IMPROVING ACCOUNTABILITY THROUGH PLANNING AND ASSESSMENT; TO AMEND SECTION 59-103-10, RELATING TO THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION, SO AS TO PROVIDE FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF THE MEMBERS FROM EACH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT TO BE BASED UPON THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE MAJORITY OF THE LEGISLATIVE DELEGATION MEMBERS FROM THE DISTRICT, PROVIDE THAT SIX MEMBERS MUST BE APPOINTED FROM THE STATE AT LARGE WITH THE ADVICE AND CONSENT OF THE SENATE, PROVIDE FOR THE DETERMINATION OF WHEN A MEMBER HAS SERVED THE MAXIMUM NUMBER OF TERMS, REQUIRE MEMBERS RECOMMENDED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY TO BE RESIDENTS OF THE APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, AND DELETE PROVISIONS RELATING TO REPRESENTATION ON THE COMMISSION AND NOTIFICATION OF MEETINGS; SECTION 59-103-35, RELATING TO SUBMISSION OF BUDGETS TO THE COMMISSION BY PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING, SO AS TO REQUIRE THE BUDGETS TO INCLUDE FUNDS DERIVED FROM APPROVED PRIVATE PRACTICE PLANS, PROVIDE FOR PROGRAMS AT A TECHNICAL AND COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATION INSTITUTION NOT TO BE TERMINATED PURSUANT TO THE COMMISSION'S RECOMMENDATION WHICH IS THE SUBJECT OF AN APPEAL, AND DELETE THE PROVISIONS DETAILING TIME LIMITS ON FEDERAL GRANT REVIEW AND BUDGET REVIEW FORMAT REQUIREMENTS AND THE PROVISIONS REQUIRING GENERAL ASSEMBLY APPROVAL OF A NEW PROGRAM, LIMITING THE APPLICATION OF THE CHAPTER, AND LIMITING THE TERMINATION OF EXISTING PROGRAMS; AND SECTION 59-113-10, RELATING TO THE HIGHER EDUCATION TUITION GRANT COMMITTEE, SO AS TO CHANGE THE REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE TO COMMISSION, PROVIDE FOR THE CHIEF

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EXECUTIVE OFFICER OF THE COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION OR HIS DESIGNEE TO SERVE ON THIS COMMISSION, PROVIDE FOR THIS COMMISSION TO BE RESPONSIBLE SOLELY TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AND REPORT AT LEAST ANNUALLY TO THAT BODY, AND DELETE THE PROVISIONS FOR THE INITIAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS; TO PROVIDE FOR THE CONTINUED SERVICE OF THE PRESENT COMMISSION MEMBERS AND THE TERMS OF NEW MEMBERS; TO DIRECT THE CODE COMMISSIONER TO CHANGE THE REFERENCES TO THE HIGHER EDUCATION TUITION GRANT COMMITTEE IN THE CODE TO THE HIGHER EDUCATION TUITION GRANT COMMISSION; AND TO PROVIDE FOR THE COMMISSION TO CONDUCT A STUDY OF OUT-OF-STATE AND IN-STATE STUDENT ENROLLMENTS IN SOUTH CAROLINA AND NEIGHBORING STATES AND TO REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina:

Initiatives for research and academic excellence

SECTION 1. Title 59 of the 1976 Code is amended by adding:

"CHAPTER 104

Initiatives for Research and Academic Excellence

Article 1

Excellence for Students

Section 59-104-10. (A) In consultation and coordination with the public institutions of higher learning in this State, the State Commission on Higher Education shall ensure that minimal admissions standards are maintained by the institutions.

The commission, with the institutions, shall monitor the effect of compliance with admissions prerequisites that are effective in fall, 1988.

(B) The boards of trustees of each public institution of higher learning, excluding the State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education, shall adopt admission policies reflecting the desired mix of in-state and out-of-state enrollment appropriate for each institution. Changes in the policies affecting the mix of in-state and out-of-state enrollment must be approved by the board of trustees of the affected institution. The boards shall submit the policies to the commission by July 1, 1989, and any subsequent changes to the policies must be submitted to the commission. For purposes of this section enrollment must be calculated on a full-time equivalency basis with the equivalent of one full-time student being a student enrolled for thirty credit hours in an academic year. Out-of-state students means students who are not eligible for in-state rates for tuition and fees under Chapter 112 of Title 59.

Section 59-104-20. The Palmetto Fellows Scholarship Program is established to foster scholarship among the state's postsecondary students and retain outstanding South Carolina high school graduates in the State through awards based on scholarship and achievement. Measures must be taken to ensure equitable minority participation in this program. Recipients of these scholarships are designated Palmetto Fellows. Each Palmetto Fellow shall receive a scholarship in an amount designated by the Commission on Higher Education, half to be provided by the postsecondary institution at which he is enrolled. The commission shall promulgate regulations and establish procedures to administer the program and request annual state appropriations for the program.

Section 59-104-30. Each public institution of higher learning in this State shall develop a plan for developmental education in accord with provisions, procedures, and requirements developed by the Commission on Higher Education. The commission shall conduct a study

as well as evaluations and reviews of developmental education in this State. The commission shall develop appropriate methods of funding developmental education programs and courses.

Section 59-104-40. (A) The technical education system in this State shall convert from the quarter calendar to the semester calendar, if funds are appropriated for this purpose. The Commission on Higher Education shall request state appropriations for the conversion to be funded and completed over a two-year period.

(B) The State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education, in consultation with the commission, shall limit the offering of courses designed for college transfer in those technical colleges that do not have approved college transfer programs. The offering of 'college parallel' general education courses in institutions not authorized to award the associate in arts or associate in science degree is limited to those necessary to support approved nontransfer programs. The commission, after consultation with the State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education and with public senior colleges and universities, shall establish rules and procedures by which this limitation must be regulated. The commission shall continue to work with all of the institutions to improve articulation concerning courses acceptable for transfer.

Article III

Excellence in Instruction and Educational Services

Section 59-104-210. A competitive grants program is established to improve undergraduate education in South Carolina. The State Commission on Higher Education shall administer the program, promulgate appropriate regulations, and request annual state appropriations for this

purpose. All public and private nonproprietary postsecondary institutions accredited by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools are eligible to participate in this program.

Section 59-104-220. The Governor's Professor of the Year Award is established as follows:

(1) Each public or private institution of higher learning in this State is eligible to nominate one faculty member for this award who has demonstrated exceptional teaching performance.

(2) The Governor's office in conjunction with the Commission on Higher Education shall establish a committee to choose the Professor of the Year. The committee must consist of representatives of the Governor's office, the commission, and appropriate civic, business, government, and academic organizations.

(3) The award must include a citation and a payment of five thousand dollars. The Governor's office shall host an appropriate ceremony at which the award must be presented.

(4) The commission shall request annual state appropriations for the award.

Section 59-104-230. The Commission on Higher Education shall request state funds and establish procedures to implement a program of endowed professorships at senior public institutions of higher learning to enable the institutions to attract or retain productive faculty scholars who are making or show promise of making substantial contributions to the intellectual life of the State.

Each professorship must be supported by the income from an endowment fund created especially for that purpose. Half of the corpus of each fund must be provided by the commission through this program, and half must be provided by the institution from private funds specifically donated for this purpose.

The State Treasurer shall establish a separate fund consisting of any funds appropriated for

all endowed professorships plus accrued interest received. Any amount remaining in the established fund at the end of any fiscal year must be carried forward to the next fiscal year to be used for endowed professorships. Funds in the specified amounts to support each endowment may be transferred by the commission to each eligible institution.

Section 59-104-240. (A) The Commission on Higher Education shall request state funds by 1990 to implement a program to endow salary enhancements for outstanding faculty in technical colleges and two-year campuses of the University of South Carolina. The purpose of the program is to enable the state's two-year college systems to retain and reward outstanding instructional personnel.

(B) The commission, in collaboration with the State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education and the University of South Carolina, shall establish procedures to implement the program. Each salary enhancement must be supported by an endowment fund created especially for that purpose. Half of the corpus of each fund must be provided by the commission through this program, and half must be provided by the institution from private sources specifically donated for this purpose.

(C) The State Treasurer shall establish a separate fund consisting of any funds appropriated for all salary enhancements plus accrued interest received. Any amount remaining in the established fund at the end of any fiscal year must be carried forward to the next fiscal year to be used for salary enhancements. Funds in the specified amounts to support each salary enhancement may be transferred by the commission to each eligible institution.

Section 59-104-250. All libraries in the technical colleges in this State shall convert to a computer-based automated system that is compatible with existing state library systems and allows for appropriate networking with

public colleges and universities if funds are appropriated for this purpose. The Commission on Higher Education shall request special appropriations to accomplish the conversion.

Section 59-104-260. The Commission on Higher Education shall encourage the development of joint programs that take advantage of the strengths of the public colleges and universities and discourage the development of independent competitive programs. The programs must be developed through planning and cooperation among the institutions in both academic and nonacademic areas.

Article V

Excellence in Research For Economic Development

Section 59-104-410. A Research Investment Fund is created to establish or expand research programs in public institutions of higher learning in this State which are related to the continued economic development of South Carolina. The fund must consist of appropriations to the State Commission on Higher Education which it allocates to the institutions for research. The funds must be apportioned among the three senior universities and the four-year colleges in a manner that takes into account the previous year's expenditures of externally generated funds for research by the institutions as reported to the commission. However, the commission may make exceptions to accommodate economic development opportunities in any area of the State.

Section 59-104-420. (A) The fund must be used for research which:

(1) has a direct, positive impact on economic development, education, health, or welfare in this State;

(2) has an existing base in faculty expertise, resources, and facilities;

(3) serves to improve the quality of undergraduate and graduate education for South Carolina citizens in accordance with the institutions' stated missions as given in the commission's master plan.

(B) The fund must not be used for capital construction projects.

Section 59-104-430. At the end of each fiscal year, comprehensive reports must be made to the Commission on Higher Education on the expenditures of funds and the results realized from the research programs. At the end of two fiscal years and each fiscal year after that, the commission shall reexamine the process of appropriating funds for research and the results obtained from the expenditures and recommend changes and alterations in the funding of research by the State if the changes are considered advisable by the commission.

Section 59-104-440. (A) With the exception of the University of South Carolina, Clemson University, and the Medical University of South Carolina, institutions seeking financial support from the fund for research projects shall submit proposals to the commission for its review and approval.

(B) The portion of the fund allocated to the three senior universities excepted in subsection (A) must be distributed in a manner that takes into account the previous year's expenditures of externally generated funds for research which each university reported to the commission.

(C) No funds allocated under the provisions of this chapter nor matching funds received pursuant to terms of this chapter may be used to increase an institution's future years' formula funding as computed by the Commission on Higher Education.

Article VII

Improving Accountability Through Planning and Assessment

Section 59-104-610. The State Commission on Higher Education shall maintain a statewide planning system to address strategic issues in public and private higher education. The system must focus upon the following goals to:

(1) identify future directions for higher education in South Carolina and recommend appropriate methods for meeting the resultant challenges;

(2) review major goals identified by the public and private institutions of higher learning in this State and ascertain their relationship to higher education in South Carolina;

(3) assure the maintenance and continued development of the quality of higher education in South Carolina;

(4) assure the maintenance and continued provision of access to and equality of educational opportunity in higher education in South Carolina.

Section 59-104-620. (A) The Commission on Higher Education shall establish an Advisory Council on Planning to assist the commission and the institutions of higher learning in maintaining planning as a high priority.

(B) The advisory council shall report to the executive committee of the commission, which shall serve as the standing committee on planning for the commission.

(C) The advisory council shall submit to the executive committee of the commission its advice, reports, and draft plans.

Section 59-104-630. The Commission on Higher Education shall ensure that each public institution of higher learning in this State maintains its individual planning process.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Section 59-104-640. (A) The chief executive officer of the Commission on Higher Education shall develop a prospectus for planning each year.

(B) In the initial year, the Advisory Council on Planning is responsible for developing a statewide planning document for submission to the commission.

(C) After the initial year and annually, the advisory council shall prepare revisions of the planning document for consideration by the commission. The revisions must conform to, but need not be limited to, the prospectus provided by the commission.

Section 59-104-650. (A) The goals for maintaining an effective system of quality assessment by institutions of higher learning in South Carolina are to:

(1) assure that a system for measuring institutional effectiveness is in effect on every public college and university campus in this State;

(2) provide a vehicle for disseminating the results of outcome measurements to the constituents within the State;

(3) provide data relative to the effectiveness of each institution that can be used to initiate curriculum, programmatic, or policy changes within the institution.

(B) The process by which these goals must be attained is as follows:

(1) Each institution of higher learning is responsible for maintaining a system to measure institutional effectiveness in accord with provisions, procedures, and requirements developed by the Commission on Higher Education. The system for measuring institutional effectiveness must include, but is not limited to, a description of criteria by which institutional effectiveness is being assessed.

(2) As a part of South Carolina's statewide planning process, each institution shall provide the commission with an annual report on the

results of its institutional effectiveness program.

(3) The commission shall prepare a report that must include results of institutional effectiveness, including student assessment programs. Information from private colleges and universities must be included for those institutions that voluntarily provide the information to the commission.

Section 59-104-660. (A) All state-supported institutions of higher learning shall establish their own procedures and programs to measure student achievement. The procedures and programs must be submitted to the Commission on Higher Education as part of the plan for measuring institutional effectiveness and must:

(1) derive from institutional initiatives, recognizing the diversity of South Carolina public colleges and universities, the tradition of institutional autonomy, and the capacity of faculty and administrators to identify their own problems and solve them creatively;

(2) be consistent with each institution's mission and educational objectives;

(3) involve faculty in setting the standards of achievement, selecting the measurement instruments, and analyzing the results;

(4) follow student progress through the curriculum, as appropriate;

(5) include follow-up of graduates.

(B) As part of their annual report on institutional effectiveness, all state-supported colleges and universities shall describe their progress in developing assessment programs and submit information on student achievement to the commission."

Membership

SECTION 2. Section 59-103-10 of the 1976 Code is amended to read:

"Section 59-103-10. There is created the State Commission on Higher Education. Two members

must be appointed by the Governor from each congressional district upon the recommendation of the majority of the legislative delegation members from the district. Six members must be appointed by the Governor from the State at large with the advice and consent of the Senate. Members must be appointed for terms of four years and until their successors are appointed and qualify. No one is eligible to serve on the commission for more than two consecutive terms. A term served by a member which is less than a full four-year term must not be counted in determining when a member has served the maximum number of terms. No member may be an employee or member of a governing body of a public or private institution of higher learning in this State. The Governor, by his appointments, shall assure that various economic interests and minority groups, especially women and blacks, are fairly represented on the commission and shall attempt to assure that the graduates of no one public or private college or technical college are dominant on the commission. Vacancies must be filled in the manner of the original appointment for the unexpired portion of the term. The chairman of the commission must be elected annually by the members of the commission and may not serve as chairman for more than four consecutive years. Members recommended by the General Assembly must be residents of the appropriate congressional district. If the boundaries of congressional districts are changed, members serving on the commission continue to serve until the expiration of their terms, but successors to members whose terms expire must be appointed from the newly defined congressional district. If a congressional district is added, the commission must be enlarged to include representation from that district."

Budgets of public institutions of higher learning programs

SECTION 3. Section 59-103-35 of the 1976 Code is amended to read:

"Section 59-103-35. All public institutions of higher learning shall submit line-item budgets to the commission in the manner set forth in this section. The State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education shall submit a single line-item budget to the commission representing the total request of all area-wide technical and comprehensive educational institutions. The budget submitted by each institution and the State Board for Technical and Comprehensive Education must include all state funds, federal grants, tuition, and fees other than funds derived wholly from athletic or other student contests, from the activities of student organizations, from approved private practice plans, and from the operation of canteens and bookstores which may be retained by the institutions and be used as determined by the respective governing boards, subject to annual audit by the State. Fees established by the respective governing boards for programs, activities, and projects not covered by appropriations or other revenues may be retained and used by each institution as previously determined by the respective governing boards, subject to annual audit by the State.

Supplemental appropriations requests from any public institution of higher education must be submitted first to the commission. If the commission does not concur in the requests the affected institution may request a hearing on the requests before the appropriate committee of the General Assembly. The commission may appear at the hearing and present its own recommendations and findings to the same committee.

No new program may be undertaken by any public institution of higher education without the approval of the commission. The provisions of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

this chapter apply to all college parallel, transferable, and associate degree programs of technical and comprehensive education institutions. All other programs and offerings of technical and comprehensive education institutions are excluded from this chapter. The commission has the authority to recommend the termination of an existing program at any institution within the purview of this chapter. An appeal from this recommendation must be made by the governing board of an affected institution within sixty days to the Senate Education Committee and the House Education and Public Works Committee which shall hear the parties to the appeal. If both committees refuse to concur in the recommendation for termination, the program must not be terminated pursuant to the recommendation of the commission which is the subject of this appeal. A decision must be reached by the committees within one hundred twenty days from the date of the filing of the appeal."

Name changed; commission members and responsibilities

SECTION 4. Section 59-113-10 of the 1976 Code is amended to read:

"Section 59-113-10. There is created a Higher Education Tuition Grant Commission consisting of eight representatives of the independent institutions of higher learning in the State who choose to come under the provisions of this chapter. In addition, the membership of the commission includes one ex officio member to be named by the House Committee on Education and Public Works, one ex officio member to be named by the Senate Committee on Education, and one ex officio member who must be the chief executive officer of the State Commission on Higher Education or his designee. The terms of the representatives of the institutions are for three years and until their successors are selected and qualify. The membership of the

commission must be rotated among the participating institutions. The commission shall administer the provisions of this chapter and shall make those regulations as may be necessary in order to carry out the intent of this chapter. The commission is responsible solely to the General Assembly and shall report to that body at least annually."

Terms

SECTION 5. (A) Members of the State Commission on Higher Education on the effective date of this act continue to serve until the expiration of their terms.

(B) Of the nine terms which expire in 1988:

(1) four members must be appointed, one from the third, fourth, fifth, and sixth congressional districts, upon the recommendation of the majority of the legislative delegation members from the district, for terms of four years;

(2) two members must be appointed, one from the first and second districts, upon the recommendation as provided in item (1), for terms of one year initially;

(3) three members must be appointed from the State at large with the advice and consent of the Senate, for terms of one year initially.

(C) Of the five terms which expire in 1989:

(1) two members must be appointed, one from the first and second districts, upon the recommendation as provided in item (1) of subsection (B), for terms of four years;

(2) three members must be appointed from the State at large, with the advice and consent of the Senate, for terms of four years.

(D) Of the nine terms which expire in 1990:

(1) four members must be appointed, one from the first, second, third, and fourth districts, upon the recommendation as provided in item (1) of subsection (B), for terms of four years;

(2) two members must be appointed, one from the fifth and sixth districts, upon the

recommendation as provided in item (1) of subsection (B), for terms of one year initially;

(3) three members must be appointed from the State at large, with the advice and consent of the Senate, for terms of one year initially.

(E) Of the five terms which expire in 1991:

(1) two members must be appointed, one from the fifth and sixth districts, upon the recommendation as provided in item (1) of subsection (B), for terms of four years;

(2) three members must be appointed from the State at large, with the advice and consent of the Senate, for terms of four years.

(F) After the initial appointments provided for in this section, the terms of the members are four years, and their successors must be appointed as provided in this act.

Code references changed

SECTION 6. The South Carolina Code Commissioner is directed to change the references in the 1976 Code to the Higher Education Tuition Grant Committee to the Higher Education Tuition Grant Commission.

Study of enrollments

SECTION 7. The State Commission on Higher Education, in consultation with the public institutions of higher learning in this State, shall conduct a study of out-of-state and in-state student enrollments in South Carolina and neighboring states. The study must examine the appropriate level of charges for out-of-state undergraduate students in South Carolina's public colleges and universities and the impact of charges on student enrollment. The commission shall report the findings of the study to the General Assembly not later than January 1, 1989.

Time effective

SECTION 8. This act takes effect upon approval by the Governor.

In the Senate House the 2nd day of June
In the Year of Our Lord One Thousand Nine Hundred and Eighty-Eight.

Nick A. Theodore,
President of the Senate

Robert J. Sheheen,
Speaker of the House of Representatives

Approved the 7th day of June, 1988.

Carroll A. Campbell, Jr.,
Governor

Printer's Date -- 6/17/88 -- S.
-----XX-----